



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,847	07/28/2003	James Jannard	NOCODE2.005C3	6079
20995	7590	06/14/2005	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			DANG, HUNG XUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2873	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,847

Applicant(s)

JANNARD ET AL.

Examiner

Hung X. Dang

Art Unit

2873

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information disclosure Statements filed on 4/1/05 have been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the first lens to pivot relative to the frame between at least first and second positions, wherein the lens provides a first magnitude of light attenuation when the first lens is in a first position and less light attenuation when the first lens is pivoted to the second position. As recited in independent claim 22. as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If

the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Swab et al** (6,769,767) in view of **Bylander** (5,654,786).

Swab et al discloses eyewear with exchangeable temples housing a transceiver forming AD HOC networks with other device comprises eyeglass frame having an interactive device electronic device support by the frame (see figure 1 and the related disclosure).

Swab et al does not disclose the lens configured to have variable light attenuation.

Bylander, however, discloses the lens 50 configured to have variable light attenuation.

Because Swab et al and Bylander are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens as disclosed by Bylander would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Swab et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Swab et al, with the lens configured to have variable light attenuation, such as disclosed by Bylander for the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC – 103

4. Claims 14-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Swab et al** (6,769,767) in view of **Young** (4,149,780).

Swab et al discloses eyewear with exchangeable temples housing a transceiver forming AD HOC networks with other device comprises eyeglass frame having an interactive device electronic device support by the frame (see figure 1 and the related disclosure).

Swab et al does not disclose the first lens to pivot relative to the frame between at least first and second positions, wherein the lens provides a first magnitude of light attenuation when the first lens is in a first position and less light attenuation when the first lens is pivoted to the second position.

Young, however, discloses the first lens to pivot relative to the frame between at least first and second positions, wherein the lens provides a first magnitude of light

attenuation when the first lens is in a first position and less light attenuation when the first lens is pivoted to the second position (see figure 1 and the related disclosure.)

Because Swab et al and Young are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens as disclosed by Young would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Swab et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Swab et al, with the first lens to pivot relative to the frame between at least first and second positions, wherein the lens provides a first magnitude of light attenuation when the first lens is in a first position and less light attenuation when the first lens is pivoted to the second position, such as disclosed by Young for the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens.

Response To Applicant's Argument

5. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Art Unit: 2873

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Dang at telephone number (571) 272-2326.

6/05



HUNG DANG

PRIMARY EXAMINER

TC 2800